

A commuting derivations theorem on UFD's

H.Derksen*,

University of Michigan, MI, USA
hderksen@umich.edu

A.van den Essen

Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands
a.vandenessen@math.ru.nl

S.Maubach[†](corresponding author)

Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands
s.maubach@math.ru.nl

June 12, 2008

Abstract

Let A be the polynomial ring over k (a field of characteristic zero) in $n+1$ variables. The commuting derivations conjecture states that n commuting locally nilpotent derivations on A , linearly independent over A , must satisfy $A^{D_1, \dots, D_m} = k[f]$ where f is a coordinate. The conjecture can be formulated as stating that a $(G_m)^n$ -action on k^{n+1} must have invariant ring $k[f]$ where f is a coordinate. In this paper we prove a statement (theorem 2.1) where we assume less on A (A is a UFD over k of transcendence degree $n+1$ satisfying $A^* = k$) and prove less ($A/(f - \alpha)$ is a polynomial ring for all but finitely many α). Under certain additional conditions (the D_i are linearly independent modulo $(f - \alpha)$ for each $\alpha \in k$) we prove that A is a polynomial ring itself and f is a coordinate. This statement is proven even more generally by replacing “free unipotent action of dimension n ” for “ G_a^n -action”.

We make links with the (Abhyankar-)Sataye conjecture and give a new equivalent formulation of the Sataye conjecture.

*Funded by NSF CAREER grant, DMS 0349019, Invariant Theory, Algorithms and Applications.

[†]Funded by Veni-grant of council for the physical sciences, Netherlands Organisation for scientific research (NWO)

1 Preliminaries and introduction

Notations: k will denote a field of characteristic zero. For a k -algebra A we define $LND(A)$ as the set of all locally nilpotent derivations, and $DER(A)$ as the set of derivations. We will denote by $A^{D_1, \dots, D_m} := \{a \in A; D_1(a) = \dots = D_m(a) = 0\}$.

In the paper [7], the following conjecture is posed:

Commuting Derivations Conjecture: Let $A := k[X_1, \dots, X_{n+1}]$, and let $D_1, \dots, D_n \in LND(A)$ be commuting, linearly independent over A , locally nilpotent derivations. Then $A^{D_1, \dots, D_n} = k[f]$ and f is a coordinate.

Geometric version: Suppose we have a $\mathcal{G} := (\mathcal{G}_a)^n$ -action on k^{n+1} . Then $k[X_1, \dots, X_{n+1}]^{\mathcal{G}} = k[f]$ and f is a coordinate.

In the elegant paper [1], it is shown that this conjecture is equivalent to the following:

Weak Abhyankar-Sataye Conjecture: Let $A := k[X_1, \dots, X_{n+1}]$, and let $f \in A$ be such that $k(f)[X_1, \dots, X_n] \cong_{k(f)} k(f)[Y_1, \dots, Y_n]$. Then f is a coordinate in A .

For completeness sake, let us state

Abhyankar-Sataye Conjecture: Let $A := k[X_1, \dots, X_{n+1}]$, and let $f \in A$ be such that $A/(f) \cong k[Y_1, \dots, Y_n]$. Then f is a coordinate.

Sataye Conjecture: Let $A := k[X_1, \dots, X_{n+1}]$, and let $f \in A$ be such that $A/(f - \alpha) \cong k[Y_1, \dots, Y_n]$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$. Then f is a coordinate.

In [7], the Commuting Derivations Conjecture is proven for $n = 3$. But there is no indication that it might be true in higher dimensions. Even more, the Vénéreau polynomials (see[8]) (or similar objects), which are candidate counterexamples to the Abhyankar-Sataye conjecture, could very well spoil things for the Commuting Derivations Conjecture in higher dimensions. In any case, it seems like a proof is far away.

Therefore, it seems a good idea to be a little less ambitious. In this paper, we consider the weaker statement that A is a UFD (instead of a polynomial ring). It turns out that the situation can be quite different and interesting. Let us consider a famous example:

Example 1.1. Let $A := \mathbb{C}[x, y, z, t] = \mathbb{C}[X, Y, Z, T]/(X^2Y + X + Z^2 + T^3)$ and let $D_1 := 2z \frac{\partial}{\partial y} - x^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$ and $D_2 := 3t^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} - x^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial t}$. A is a UFD of transcendence degree 3 which is not a polynomial ring (see [6], or use the fact that the commuting derivations conjecture in dimension 3 holds). D_1 and D_2 commute, and $A^{D_1, D_2} = \mathbb{C}[x]$. Now $A/(x - \alpha) \cong \mathbb{C}[Y_1, Y_2]$ except in the case that $\alpha = 0$.

Also, $D_1 \bmod (x - \alpha), D_2 \bmod (x - \alpha)$ are independent over $A/(x - \alpha)$ if and only if $\alpha \neq 0$.

2 The UFD Commuting derivations theorem

The following theorem is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 2.1. *Let A be a UFD over k with $\text{trdeg}_k Q(A) = n + 1 (\geq 1)$, $A^* = k^*$, and let $D_1, \dots, D_n$ be commuting locally nilpotent derivations (linearly independent over A). Now $A^{D_1, \dots, D_n} = k[f]$ for some $f \in A \setminus k$, and*

1. *If $D_1 \bmod (f - \alpha), \dots, D_n \bmod (f - \alpha)$ are independent over $A/(f - \alpha)$, then $A/(f - \alpha) \cong \mathbb{C}^{[n]}$. There are only finitely many $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ for which $D_1 \bmod (f - \alpha), \dots, D_n \bmod (f - \alpha)$ are dependent over $A/(f - \alpha)$.*
2. *In the case that $D_1 \bmod (f - \alpha), \dots, D_n \bmod (f - \alpha)$ are independent over $A/(f - \alpha)$ for each $\alpha \in k$, then $A = k[s_1, \dots, s_n, f]$, a polynomial ring in $n + 1$ variables.*

Geometric Version: *Let V be a factorial affine surface over k of dimension $n + 1$ such that $\mathcal{O}(V)^* = k^*$. Suppose there exists a $\mathcal{G} := (\mathcal{G}_a)^n$ -action on V . Then $\mathcal{O}(V)^{\mathcal{G}} = k[f]$ and*

1. *Suppose that the fiber $f = \alpha$ has a point with trivial stabilizer. Then the fiber $f = \alpha$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}^n$. There are only finitely many α for which $f = \alpha$ has no point with trivial stabilizer.*
2. *Suppose that all fibers $f = \alpha$ have a point with trivial stabilizer. (Then, all points have trivial stabilizers.) Then $V \cong \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ and the action $\mathcal{G} \times V \longrightarrow V$ is a translation on the first n coordinates.*

In the last section we will prove a more general geometric statement of part 2 for unipotent groups in stead of $\mathcal{G}_a^n$ -actions, but we will stick with this description for the moment, as this is the most interesting case for us, and has a simpler, direct, algebraic proof.

Before we give a proof of the above theorem, let us meditate on this a bit. The example 1.1 is a typical case of part 1 of the above theorem. But there is a connection with the Sataye Conjecture. Let us consider the following conjecture:

Modified Sataye Conjecture: Let $A := k[X_1, \dots, X_{n+1}]$, and let $f \in A$ be such that $A/(f - \alpha) \cong k[Y_1, \dots, Y_n]$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$. Then there exist n commuting locally nilpotent derivations $D_1, \dots, D_n$ on A such that $A^{D_1, \dots, D_n} = \mathbb{C}[f]$ and the D_i are linearly independent modulo $(f - \alpha)$ for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$.

Proposition 2.2. *The Modified Sataye Conjecture is equivalent to the Sataye Conjecture.*

Proof. Let us abbreviate the conjectures by SC and MSC. Suppose we have proven the MSC. Then for any f satisfying “ $A/(f - \alpha) \cong k[Y_1, \dots, Y_n]$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ ” we can find commuting derivations as stated in the MSC. But using theorem 2.1 part 2 we get that f is a coordinate in A . So the SC is true in that case.

Now suppose we have proven the SC. Let f satisfy the requirements of the MSC, that is, “ $A/(f - \alpha) \cong k[Y_1, \dots, Y_n]$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ ”. Since f satisfies the requirements of the SC, f then must be a coordinate. So it has n so-called mates: $\mathbb{C}[f, f_1, \dots, f_n] = \mathbb{C}[X_1, \dots, X_{n+1}]$. But then each of these $n + 1$ polynomials $f, f_1, \dots, f_n$ defines a locally nilpotent derivation, all of them commute, and the intersection of the last n derivations is $\mathbb{C}[f]$; so the MSC holds. $\square$

But now it is time to stop daydreaming about big conjectures, and start doing some hard-core proofs. Since the following proof uses the tools of the next section, the reader is encouraged to read section 3 before reading the following proof in detail.

Proof. (of theorem 2.1) Using lemma 3.4 we have $p_i \in A$ such that $D_j(p_i) = 0$ if $i \neq j$, and $D_i(p_i) = q_i(f) \in \mathbb{C}[f]$ of lowest possible degree.

Part 1: $D_1, \dots, D_n$ are independent over A , but they may become dependent modulo $(f - \alpha)$. Let us first consider the case where they are independent modulo $(f - \alpha)$: then $\bar{D}_1, \dots, \bar{D}_n$ are linearly independent over $A/(f - \alpha)$. Then, by proposition 3.1 we have that $A/(f - \alpha) \cong k^n$.

So, left to prove is that $D_1, \dots, D_n$ can only be linearly dependent modulo finitely many $(f - \alpha)$. But this follows directly from lemma 3.5, as there are only finitely many zeroes in $q_1 q_2 \cdots q_n$.

Part 2: Lemma 3.5 tells us directly that for each $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $\alpha \in k$, we have $q_i(\alpha) \neq 0$. But this means that the $q_i \in k^*$, so the p_i are in fact slices, and using 3.3 we are done. $\square$

3 Tools

The tools proven in this section focus on the situation of theorem 2.1 part 1, and are interesting in their own respect.

In this section, A is a k -domain, and $\text{trdeg}(A) = n + 1 (\geq 1)$.

The following two propositions are proposition 3.2 and 3.4 in [7].

Proposition 3.1. *Let $D_1, \dots, D_{n+1}$ be commuting locally nilpotent k -derivations on A which are linearly independent over A . Then*

- (i). *There exist s_i in A such that $D_i s_i = \delta_{ij}$ for all i, j and*
- (ii). *$A = k[s_1, \dots, s_{n+1}]$ a polynomial ring in $n + 1$ variables over k .*

Proposition 3.2. *Let A be a UFD and let $A^* = k^*$. Let $D_1, \dots, D_n$ be commuting locally nilpotent derivations, linearly independent over A . Then $A^{D_1, \dots, D_n} = k[f]$ for some $f \in A \setminus k$, and $f - \alpha$ is irreducible for each $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$.*

Proposition 3.3. *Let A, D_i, f as in proposition 3.2. Suppose there exist $s_1, \dots, s_n$ such that $D_i(s_i) = 1$. Then $A = k[s_1, \dots, s_n, f]$, a polynomial ring in $n + 1$ variables.*

Proof. This is an easy consequence of the fact that, if $D \in \text{LND}(A)$ having an $s \in A$ such that $D(s) = 1$, then $A^D[s] = A$. $\square$

Define the following abbreviation:

(S1:) Let A be a UFD and let $A^* = k^*$. Let $D_1, \dots, D_n$ be commuting locally nilpotent derivations, linearly independent over A .

Lemma 3.4. *Assume (S1).*

- (1) *Then there exist $p_i \in A$ such that $D_j(p_i) = 0$ if $j \neq i$, and $D_i(p_i) \in k[f] \setminus \{0\}$. Furthermore, $k[p_1, \dots, p_n, f] \subseteq A$ is algebraic.*
- (2) *Define $\mathcal{P}_i := \{p_i \in A \mid D_j(p_i) = 0 \text{ if } i \neq j \text{ and } D_i(p_i) \in k[f]\}$. then $D_i(\mathcal{P}_i) = q_i(f)k[f]$ for some nonzero polynomial q_i . Taking p_i such that $D_i(p_i)$ is of lowest possible degree yields $D_i(p_i) \in kq_i(f)$.*

Proof. (1) We assume that all n derivations commute, so $D_i(A^{D_j}) \subseteq A^{D_j}$. and therefore D_i sends $A_i := A^{D_1, \dots, D_{i-1}, D_{i+1}, \dots, D_n}$ to itself. Taking some $a \in A_i \setminus \mathbb{C}[f]$ nonzero, we use the fact that D_i is locally nilpotent to find the lowest $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $D^m(a) = 0$. Now define $p_i := D^{m-2}(a)$ (indeed $m \geq 2$). The rest is easy.

(2) Take p_i such that $D_i(p_i) = q_i(f) \neq 0$ has lowest possible degree. Let $\tilde{p}_i \in \mathcal{P}_i$. then $D_i(\tilde{p}_i) = h_i(f)q_i(f) + r_i(f)$ where $\deg(r_i) < \deg(q_i)$. Now $D_i(\tilde{p}_i - h_i(f)p_i) = r_i(f)$ so $r_i = 0$. So $D_i(\tilde{p}_i) \in q_i(f)\mathbb{C}[f]$. $\square$

Lemma 3.5. *Assume (S1). Choose p_i such that $D_i(p_i) = q_i(f)$ as in lemma 3.4, where q_i is of lowest possible degree. The D_i are linearly dependent modulo $f - \alpha$ if and only if $q_i(\alpha) = 0$ for some i .*

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$): Write “bars” for “modulo $f - \alpha$ ”. Suppose that $0 \neq \overline{D} := g_1 D_1 + \dots + g_n D_n$ satisfies $\overline{D} = 0$ where $g_i \in A$, and not all $\overline{g}_i = \overline{0}$. Now $\overline{g}_i \overline{D}_i(\overline{p}_i) = \overline{D}(\overline{p}_i) = \overline{0}$ for each i , so for each i , either $\overline{g}_i = \overline{0}$ or $\overline{q_i(f)} = \overline{0}$ (as $f - \alpha$ is irreducible by proposition 3.2). Since not all $\overline{g}_i = \overline{0}$, at least one $\overline{q_i(f)} = \overline{0}$. Since $f - \alpha$ is irreducible for each α , we not only have $(f - \alpha) \mid q_i(f)$, but even $(X - \alpha) \mid q_i(X)$, so $q_i(\alpha) = 0$.

($\Leftarrow$): Assume $f - \alpha$ divides $q_i(f)$. We need to show that the $D_i \pmod{f - \alpha}$ are linearly dependent over $A/(f - \alpha)$. Suppose the $\overline{D}_i$ are linearly independent over $\overline{A}$. Then we have n commuting, linearly independent LNDs on a domain of transcendence degree n , so we can use proposition 3.1 and conclude that $\overline{A}^{\overline{D}_1, \dots, \overline{D}_n} = k$. This means, since $\overline{q_i(f)} = 0$, that $\overline{p}_i \in k$. So, $p_i = (f - \alpha)a + \lambda$ where $a \in A, \lambda \in k$. Now taking $a \in A$ we still have $D_j(a) = 0$ for all $j \neq i$, and $D_i(a) = q_i(f)(f - \alpha)^{-1} \in \mathbb{C}[f]$. This contradicts the assumption that q_i was minimal, so our assumption that the $\overline{D}_i$ are linearly independent was incorrect. $\square$

Now we want to point out the following phenomenon:

Example 3.6. Let $D_1 = Z\partial_X + \partial_Y, D_2 = \partial_Y$ on $A = \mathbb{C}[X, Y, Z]$. Now $A^{D_1, D_2} = \mathbb{C}[Z]$. The D_1, D_2 are linearly independent modulo $Z - \alpha$ as long as $\alpha \neq 0$. But it is clear that a different set of derivations, namely $E_1 = \partial_X, E_2 = \partial_Y$ commute, their $\mathbb{C}[Z]$ -span contains D_1, D_2 and the E_i are linearly independent for more fibers $f - \alpha$.

The E_i of the example are an improvement over the D_i : all the same properties, but they are linearly independent for more $f - \alpha$. Perhaps for your given space A and derivations D_i it is impossible to find E_i such that the E_i are independent modulo every $f - \alpha$, giving more information on your ring A . Before we elaborate on this, let us give a lemma that enables construction of the E_i :

Lemma 3.7. *Assume (S1). Define $\mathcal{M} := k(f)D_1 + \dots + k(f)D_n \cap \text{DER}(A)$. Then $\mathcal{M} = k[f]E_1 \oplus \dots \oplus k[f]E_n$ for some $E_i \in \mathcal{M}$, and the E_i have all the properties that the D_i have (i.e. commuting locally nilpotent, linearly independent over A). Furthermore, if the D_i are linearly independent modulo $(f - \alpha)$, then the E_i are too (but not necessary the other way around).*

Proof. Use lemma 3.4 we find preslices p_i and $D(p_i) = q_i(f)$ as stated there.

If $D \in \mathcal{M}$ then $D = g_1(f)D_1 + \dots + g_n(f)D_n$ where $g_i(f) \in k(f)$. Now since $D \in \text{DER}(A)$ we have $D(p_i) \in A$. Also $D(p_i) = g_i(f)D_i(p_i) = g_i(f)q_i(f) \in k(f)$ thus $D(p_i) \in A \cap k(f)$, which equals $k[f]$ since $A^* = k^*$.

Therefore the map $\varphi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow k[f]^n$ sending $D \rightarrow (D(p_1), \dots, D(p_n))$ is well-defined. If $0 = \varphi(g_1(f)D_1 + \dots + g_n(f)D_n)$ then $g_i(f)D_i(p_i) = 0$ and therefore $g_i(f) = 0$; thus φ is injective.

Since φ is an injective map, $\mathcal{M}$ must be a free $k[f]$ -module. Note that $\mathcal{M}$ can only have dimension n . Therefore we can find $E_1, \dots, E_n$ as required.

Any derivation in $\mathcal{M}$ is locally nilpotent. Even more, any two derivations of $\mathcal{M}$ commute! Next to that, the E_i are clearly independent over A . $\square$

Note that the E_i can be constructively made, given the injective map φ in the above proof. This actually gives an interesting concept. Given the situation (S1), one can improve the derivations D_i (by replacing them by the E_i) and then they are linearly independent modulo as much as possible $f - \alpha$. For every such α we have that $A/(f - \alpha)$ is a polynomial ring. The question is if the converse holds:

Question: Assume (S1). Additionally, assume $k[f]D_1 + \dots + k[f]D_n = (k(f)D_1 + \dots + k(f)D_n) \cap \text{DER}(A)$. Is the set $\{\alpha \in \mathbb{C} \mid D_1, \dots, D_n \text{ linearly dependent modulo } (f - \alpha)\}$ equal to the set $\{\alpha \in \mathbb{C} \mid A/(f - \alpha) \text{ is not a polynomial ring}\}$? (One always has $\supseteq$.) Or, if this equality does not hold, what type of rings A do have equality?

Note that the requirement “ A UFD” is absolutely necessary, as for a simple Danielewski surface $\mathbb{C}[X, Y, Z]/(X^2Y - Z^2)$ we find a LND $2Z\partial_Y + X^2\partial_Z$ which

is nonzero modulo each $X - \alpha$. (But $A/(f - \alpha)$ is not always a domain in this case, even.)

4 Unipotent actions

The authors would like to thank prof. Kraft for pointing out the generalization of theorem 2.1 part 2, which has become the below theorem 4.2.

Proposition 4.1. *If $U \times V \longrightarrow V$ is an action of a unipotent group U on an affine variety V , then for each $u \in U$, the map $u^* : \mathcal{O}(V) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}(V)$ is an exponent of a locally nilpotent derivation.*

For the proof we can refer to proposition 2.1.3 in [2], or ask the reader to verify that $u^* - \text{Id}$ is a locally nilpotent endomorphism, and that thus “ $\log(u^*)$ ” can be defined, and is a derivation.

This proposition has some immediate consequences, like that the invariants of a unipotent group action are the intersection of kernels of locally nilpotent derivations. Since kernels of locally nilpotent derivations are factorially closed, their intersection is too, so the invariants of a unipotent group is factorially closed.

In the below theorem, $\mathbb{C}$ is a field of characteristic zero, which is algebraically closed.

Theorem 4.2. *Let U be a unipotent algebraic group of dimension n , acting freely on X , a factorial variety of dimension $n + 1$ satisfying $\mathcal{O}(X)^* = \mathbb{C}^*$. Then X is U -isomorphic to $U \times \mathbb{C}$. In particular, $X \simeq \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$.*

Proof. The fact that U acts free means that each $x \in X$ has trivial stabilizer: $U_x = \{u \in U; ux = x\} = \{\text{id}\}$. So, each orbit Ux is of dimension n . This means that $X//U$ is of dimension 1. Also, as remarked above, X^U is factorial. But then it is also normal, and smooth. So $X//U$ is a smooth, rational, affine curve, in other words, an open subvariety of $\mathbb{C}$. Now suppose that $X//U \not\cong \mathbb{C}$, so $X//U = \mathbb{C} - \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}$, then $\mathcal{O}(X)^U = \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{C} - \{p_1, \dots, p_n\}) = \mathbb{C}[t, (t - p_1)^{-1}, \dots, (t - p_n)^{-1}]$. This means that $\mathcal{O}(X)$ contains invertible elements $(t - p_1)^{-1}$, giving a contradiction with the assumption $\mathcal{O}(X)^* = \mathbb{C}^*$. Hence, $X//U \simeq \mathbb{C}$, so $\mathcal{O}(X)^U = \mathcal{O}(X//U) = \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{C}) \cong \mathbb{C}[f]$ for some f . Now every $f - \lambda$ ($\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$) is irreducible, as otherwise any irreducible factor of $f - \lambda$ would be in $\mathcal{O}(X)^U$ too.

Now consider the map $f : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$. This is in fact the map $X \longrightarrow X//U$ (as it corresponds to the map $\mathcal{O}(X) \longleftarrow \mathcal{O}(X)^U = \mathbb{C}[f]$) and thus surjective. Also note that the fibers $f^{-1}(\lambda)$ are invariant under U : they correspond to the function space $\mathcal{O}(X)/(f - \lambda)$. By assumption, U acts free on each fiber of $X \longrightarrow X//U$, which means exactly that U acts free on $f^{-1}(\lambda)$ for each λ . Let $x \in f^{-1}(\lambda)$. Then Ux is of dimension n (it is just a copy of U). Also, each orbit of a unipotent group is closed (see Satz 4 from [3]), and therefore the inclusion $Ux \subseteq f^{-1}(\lambda)$ is an equality. So orbits of U are the same as fibers of f , i.e. we have an orbit fibration (or U -fibration).

X_{sing} is closed and U -stable, hence a union of U -orbits, and so $\text{codim } X_{\text{sing}} = 1$ or X_{sing} is empty. But X is factorial, so in particular normal, which implies $\text{codim}(X_{\text{sing}}) \geq 2$. So X_{sing} is empty, in other words: X is smooth.

Now we claim that $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is smooth. To see this, first note that $\mathcal{O}(f^{-1}(\lambda)) = \mathcal{O}(X)/(f - \lambda)$ is reduced as $f - \lambda$ is irreducible, as seen before. And, as we already implied, the set of functions vanishing on $f^{-1}(\lambda)$ is the ideal $(f - \lambda)$. Now consider the tangent map $df_x : T_x X \rightarrow T_\lambda \mathbb{C} = \mathbb{C}$ where $x \in f^{-1}(\lambda)$. Using ‘‘Satz 2’’, page 269 in [3] we see that, $\ker df \supseteq T_x f^{-1}(\lambda)$, but since $f^{-1}(\lambda)$ is reduced, we even have equality $\ker df = T_x f^{-1}(\lambda)$. Now remember that the fiber $f^{-1}(\lambda)$ is an orbit, hence smooth (as any orbit is smooth!). This implies $\dim T_x f^{-1}(\lambda) = n$ and thus $\dim \ker df = n$. Since $\dim T_x X = n + 1$ we have $\dim \text{Im}(df_x) = 1$, hence df_x is surjective. A morphism between smooth varieties is smooth if and only if the differential is surjective. So we have shown that f is smooth.

So: $f : X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is surjective, and smooth. Let $K := \ker df|_x \subset T_x X$. Take some linear subspace C such that $K \oplus C = T_x X$. Note that C has dimension 1. Seeing X as a subset of some $\mathbb{C}^N$, we can find hyperplanes H that contains C . We even want $H \cap T_x X = C$, so this means that $H \oplus T_x \subseteq \mathbb{C}^N$, so let us take a hyperplane H of codimension n such that $H \cap T_x X = C$. Now let Z be an irreducible component of $H \cap X$ which contains x . Also, $\dim_x H \cap X \geq 1$, thus $\dim_x Z = 1$ and Z is smooth at x . Now Z and $\mathbb{C}$ are smooth, and the differential of $f|_Z : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is an isomorphism at x (implying surjective), thus we have that $f|_Z$ is smooth at x . Replacing Z , if necessary, by a (special) open subset $Z' \subset Z$, we have $f|_{Z'}$ is étale.

Now look at the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Z \times_{\mathbb{C}} X & \xrightarrow{p} & X \\ \downarrow \bar{f} & & \downarrow f \\ Z & \xrightarrow{f|_Z} & \mathbb{C} \end{array}$$

where $Z \times_{\mathbb{C}} X = \{(x, z) \in X \times Z \mid f(x) = f|_Z(z)\}$ is the (schematic) fiber product. Since f is smooth, the same holds for $\bar{f}$ and so $Z \times_{\mathbb{C}} X$ is smooth. Moreover, U acts on $Z \times_{\mathbb{C}} X$ by $u(z, x) = (z, ux)$ and $p(u(x, z)) = ux$ (p is U -equivariant) and $f(u(x, z)) = z = f|_Z(z)$ (f is U -invariant). The fibers of $\bar{f}$ are $\bar{f}^{-1}(z) = \{(x, z) \mid f(x) = f|_Z(z)\} = \{x \mid f(x) = \alpha\} = f^{-1}(\alpha)$ where $\alpha = f|_Z(z)$. Now $\bar{f}$ has a section $\sigma : Z \rightarrow Z \times_{\mathbb{C}} X$ given by $z \mapsto (z, z)$, i.e. $\bar{f} \circ \sigma = \text{id}_Z$. Therefore, we can extend the diagram above

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} U \times Z & \xrightarrow{q} & Z \times_{\mathbb{C}} X & \xrightarrow{p} & X \\ \downarrow \text{pr}_Z & & \downarrow \bar{f} & & \downarrow f \\ Z & \xlongequal{\quad} & Z & \xrightarrow{f|_Z} & \mathbb{C} \end{array}$$

where $q : U \times Z \rightarrow Z \times_{\mathbb{C}} X$ is given by $(u, z) \mapsto (z, uz)$. By construction, q is bijective, hence an isomorphism, since the second variety is normal (see [4])

proposition 5.7). Note that the role of x was arbitrary: for each x we find a neighborhood Z where $Z \times_{\mathbb{C}} X = Z \times_{\mathbb{C}} U$. This last statement exactly means that the map $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a locally trivial principal U -bundle with respect to the étale topology: for every point $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ there is an étale map $Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that λ is in the image and the fiber product $Z \times_{\mathbb{C}} X$ is a trivial U -bundle, i.e. isomorphic to $U \times Z \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_Z} Z$.

In the paper [5] we now find a result that tells us that a principal G -bundle where G is a unipotent group is trivial over any affine variety, and then we are done.

□

References

- [1] M'hammed El Kahoui, *UFDs with commuting linearly independent locally nilpotent derivations*, J. of Algebra 289 (1): 446-452, 2005
- [2] A. van den Essen, *Polynomial Automorphisms and the Jacobian Conjecture*, Progress in Math, vol 190, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, Boston, Berlin, 2000.
- [3] H.Kraft, *Geometrische Methoden in der Invariantentheorie*, Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn Verlagsgesellschaft mbH, Braunschweig 1984.
- [4] H.Kraft, *Basics from Algebraic Geometry*, lecture notes, see <http://www.math.unibas.ch/~kraft/Notizen/AlgTG.pdf> (will be published as part of the "Hanoi ICPA2006" lecture notes).
- [5] H.Kraft, G.-W.Schwarz, *Reductive group actions with one-dimensional quotient*. Publ. Math. IHES **76** (1992) 1–97.
- [6] L. Makar-Limanov, *On the hypersurface $x + x^2y + z^2 + t^3 = 0$ in $\mathbb{C}^4$ or a $\mathbb{C}^3$ -like threefold which is not $\mathbb{C}^3$* , Israel J. Math., 96(1996), 419-429
- [7] S.Maubach, *The commuting derivations conjecture*, J.Pure Appl. Algebra, 179(1-2):159-168,(2003)
- [8] S. Vénéreau, *Is $y + x[xz + y(yu + z^2)]$ an x -variable of $\mathbb{C}[x][y, z, u]$?*, Problem session, Workshop on group action on rational varieties, (2002), 6p.